

*Citation for published version:*

Price, GJ & Shillcock, IM 2002, 'Inverse gas chromatographic measurement of solubility parameters in liquid crystalline systems', *Journal of Chromatography A*, vol. 964, no. 1-2, pp. 199-204.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673\(02\)00651-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673(02)00651-9)

*DOI:*

[10.1016/S0021-9673\(02\)00651-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673(02)00651-9)

*Publication date:*

2002

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *Journal of Chromatography A*. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *Journal of Chromatography A*, vol 964, issue 1-2, DOI 10.1016/S0021-9673(02)00651-9

**University of Bath**

## **Alternative formats**

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:  
[openaccess@bath.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@bath.ac.uk)

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# INVERSE GAS CHROMATOGRAPHIC MEASUREMENT OF SOLUBILITY PARAMETERS IN LIQUID CRYSTALLINE SYSTEMS

Gareth J. Price\* and Ian M. Shillcock

Department of Chemistry, University of Bath, BATH, BA2 7AY, U.K.

\* Author for correspondence and proofs. Fax: +44 1225 836231, E-mail: g.j.price@bath.ac.uk

---

## ABSTRACT

Inverse gas Chromatography, IGC, has been used to measure interaction parameters in two low molar mass liquid crystals and a polymer substituted with the same mesogenic group. Solubility parameters have been calculated. The IGC method is shown to be applicable to this class of compound and to give meaningful values over a range of temperatures.

**Keywords:** Liquid crystal; IGC; solubility parameter; interaction parameter.

## INTRODUCTION

Inverse Gas Chromatography, IGC, has proved to be a versatile and very useful technique for the measurement of thermodynamic parameters in a range of non-volatile materials such as polymers over a wide range of conditions[1-3]. In particular, it can provide a wealth of information on interactions between solvents and polymers in very concentrated polymer solutions since measurements are made effectively at infinite dilution where a small amount of solute is injected to “probe” the properties of the stationary phase. Knowledge of these interactions is of use in a range of applications such as inks, paints and surface coatings.

While acknowledging its limitations, the solubility parameter concept is still widely used in polymer science to give a rough and ready approximation of solubility behaviour. The solubility parameter,  $\delta$ , is the square-root of the cohesive energy density of a compound and thus is a measure of the strength of its intermolecular forces[4]. It is related to the enthalpy of vaporisation,  $\Delta H^{\text{vap}}$  and the molar volume,  $V_1^\circ$  by

$$\delta_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\Delta H^{\text{vap}} - RT}{V_1^\circ}} \quad (1)$$

There are many methods for estimating  $\delta$  but generally they are only applicable around room temperature. Extending the work of Bristow and Watson[5], Guillet and co-workers[6,7] demonstrated that IGC could usefully be applied to the measurements and would allow access to a wide range of temperatures.

In a non-volatile stationary phase, retention is governed by interaction with the probe. The Flory-Huggins model of solution thermodynamics uses an interaction parameter,  $\chi$ , to characterise this.  $\chi$  is readily calculable from IGC retention data[1]. While originally introduced to correlate the enthalpy of mixing in a solution, it is more correctly identified as a residual free energy term, accounting for all contributions to the Gibbs free energy other than combinatorial mixing. It thus has an entropic element and can be represented as

$$\chi = \chi_H + \chi_S \quad (2)$$

If we assume that the  $\chi_H$  is adequately described by regular solution theory and hence by the difference in solubility parameter between the probe and polymer, then it can readily be shown[6] that

$$\left( \frac{\delta_1^2}{RT} - \frac{\chi}{V_1^\circ} \right) = 2 \left( \frac{\delta_2}{RT} \right) \delta_1 - \left( \frac{\delta_2^2}{RT} + \frac{\chi^S}{V_1^\circ} \right) \quad (3)$$

where  $\chi^S$  is the residual entropy contribution and 1 and 2 refer to probe and polymer respectively. A plot of the left hand side against the probe solubility parameter,  $\delta_1$ , yields the polymer solubility parameter,  $\delta_2$ , from the gradient and the entropic contribution to the interaction parameter from the intercept. This approach, which was reviewed by Price[8], has been applied to a wide range of materials including polymers[9], pharmaceutical products[10], liquid crystals [11], organic pollutants[12] and biological materials[13]. It has also been used as a predictive tool in gas chromatography[14], reversed-phase hplc[15,16], supercritical fluid[17] and electrokinetic[18] chromatographies.

Liquid crystal systems are gaining increasing use in dyes and surface coatings, as dispersions in polymers and also as chromatographic stationary phases[19-21]. The anisotropic molecular alignment in these materials has provided novel effects. Thus it was of interest to determine whether IGC derived solubility parameters could be measured and give useful information on these systems.

## EXPERIMENTAL

The liquid crystals studied were 4-(n-hexyloxy)-4'-cyanobiphenyl, **HCB**, 4-(n-octyloxy)-4'-scyanobiphenyl, **OCB**, and a siloxane polymer substituted with the same mesogen, poly(dimethyl-co-methyl(4-cyanobiphenoxy)butyl siloxane), **PMCB**, which had 40 repeat units. For comparison with the LC polymer backbone, values were also recorded for a linear poly(dimethyl siloxane), PDMS. They were all supplied by Merck(UK) Ltd. with reported

purities of 99.5+ %. All probe solvents (Aldrich Chemicals or Merck Ltd.) were 99% pure or better. The probes used were n-alkanes (pentane – nonane), five isomeric heptanes, benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene and the three xylene isomers.

HCB has a nematic mesophase between 57 and 76 °C. OCB displays a nematic mesophase between 67 and 76 °C and also has a Smectic-A mesophase between 55 and 67 °C. The polymer also has a Smectic-A mesophase between -4 and 79 °C. Above these temperature ranges, all the compounds form isotropic liquids.

The methods and techniques used were entirely standard for thermodynamic measurements at infinite dilution by IGC. Full details have been published previously[22,23]. Briefly, the specific retention volumes,  $V_g^\circ$ , for ~ 0.01  $\mu$ L injections of the probe vapours were measured at infinite dilution using nitrogen as the carrier gas and stationary phases consisting of 8 – 14% by weight of the LC coated onto acid washed, silanized Chromosorb P (100-120 mesh). Analysis of the results showed the  $V_g^\circ$  to be accurate to  $\pm 1.5\%$ . In IGC measurements, there is the possibility that adsorption onto the support can contribute to retention. This was minimised by using a silanized support and previous work [22, 23] has shown that there was no variation of retention volume with stationary phase loading in the range used here, indicating that surface adsorption effects are insignificant compared with bulk sorption. Additionally, there was no influence on the liquid crystalline properties.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The specific retention volume,  $V_g^\circ$ , was calculated[24] from the probe retention time,  $t_R$ , by

$$V_g^\circ = \frac{(t_R - t_M)F'J}{W} \quad (4)$$

where  $t_M$  is the retention time of the methane marker and  $W$  is the mass of stationary phase on the column.  $F'$  is the carrier gas flow rate fully corrected to S.T.P. and  $J$  is the correction for gas

compressibility in the column. Full details of these corrections are available in the Literature[24].

The Flory-Huggins interaction parameter at infinite dilution,  $\chi^\infty$ , can be calculated using

$$\chi^\infty = \ln\left(\frac{273.15R}{Vg^\circ p_1^\circ M_1}\right) - \left(\frac{p_1^\circ(B_{11} - V_1)}{RT}\right) - \left(1 - \frac{V_1^\circ}{V_2^\circ}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{M_1 V_2^\circ}{M_2 V_1^\circ}\right) \quad (5)$$

where  $B_{11}$  and  $p_1^\circ$  are respectively the second virial coefficient and the saturated vapour pressure of the probe vapour at the column temperature  $T$ .  $M$  and  $V$  represent the RMM and molar volume. These values were used in Equation (3) along with probe solubility parameters calculated from Literature data[25] to calculate values of  $\delta_2$ .

An illustration of the method applied to a linear polymer is shown for PDMS at two temperatures in Figure 1. Excellent linear relations were obtained (correlation coefficient  $> 0.9994$ ) at both temperatures allowing a good estimate of  $\delta_2$  to be obtained. The values are given in Table 1.

Most literature values for solubility parameters have been reported at 25 °C. These were usually obtained by extrapolation of interaction parameter data from higher temperatures or, less commonly, by direct measurement[26]. While the temperature dependence of the solubility parameter is considerably smaller than that of the interaction parameters, Figure 1 shows that it is not insignificant. To obtain the temperature dependence of the solubility parameters for the systems studied here, values were measured at four temperatures in each phase and mesophase and the results fitted to an empirical relationship

$$\delta \text{ (J cm}^{-3}\text{)}^{1/2} = C - A \text{ (T }^\circ\text{C)} \quad (6)$$

where  $C$  and  $A$  are constants. The extrapolated value of PDMS at 25 °C of  $15.2 \pm 0.2 \text{ (J cm}^{-3}\text{)}^{1/2}$  is in good agreement with the literature[27] values which range between 14.9 and 15.5  $\text{(J cm}^{-3}\text{)}^{1/2}$ .

The solubility parameter plots for the liquid crystalline HCB are shown in Figure 2. Two factors are immediately apparent; there is much less temperature dependence than with PDMS

and the fit to a linear relation is not as good. Similar results were found for the other two LC compounds investigated. The reason for the latter observation is that the LC's distinguish between the aromatic and aliphatic probe to a greater degree than PDMS. The aromatic probes will interact strongly with the aromatic biphenyl moieties in the LC's. In addition, the solubility parameters will be slightly different in each mesophase.

Hansen[28] first suggested a development of the solubility parameter approach by considering the effect of polar interactions. He proposed that the interaction energies could be considered as additive contributions from dispersion and polar interactions;

$$\delta^2 = \delta_d^2 + \delta_p^2 + \delta_h^2 \quad (7)$$

Where the subscripts d, p, h denote contributions from dispersion, polar, and hydrogen bonding energies, respectively. This approach has been employed in the analysis of the solubility parameters of GC stationary phases using the inverse gas chromatography technique[8,29].

Probes that interact only with dispersion intermolecular forces (*i.e.* the n-alkanes) should give a linear relation when plotted according to Equation (3). However, probes that have other contributions to their retention will deviate from the line, the degree of deviation being a measure of the strength of the polar components. In the current work, none of the probes has a tendency to hydrogen bond so that only the first two terms of Equation (7) will apply.

A typical plot is given in Figure 3 for HCB and the difference between the two classes of probe is clear. The contributions to  $\delta_2$  for each of the compounds studied are shown in Table 1. In the LC phases of each of the systems, the polar contribution to the solubility parameter is quite constant, within the uncertainty of the method. There is significant difference between the three LC's although not between the mesophases of each compound. The dispersion contribution generally decreases as temperature is raised. This would be expected due to the smaller effect thermal disruption of the molecules would have on more polar interactions. Also, PDMS exhibits considerably smaller polar contributions than the liquid crystal systems at all temperatures. The overall solubility parameter for PDMS varies between 13.5-14.5 (J cm<sup>-3</sup>)<sup>1/2</sup> as

temperature decreases from 90 °C to 60 °C whereas the liquid crystal systems all exhibit higher values between 16.5-17.5 (J cm<sup>-3</sup>)<sup>1/2</sup> more indicative of the aromatic fragments in the molecules. The results corroborate previous observations that PDMS favours aliphatic solvents whilst these liquid crystals favour aromatic solvents.

Values calculated from all the probes for each system are plotted as a function of temperature in Figure 4. With the liquid crystal systems the solubility parameters could be fitted to a single linear relationship through all phases and mesophases without incurring significant too large an error. The regression equations for these were:

$$\text{HCB: } \delta_2 = 19.02 - 0.0225 T$$

$$\text{OCB: } \delta_2 = 18.76 - 0.0210 T$$

$$\text{PMCB: } \delta_2 = 18.27 - 0.0228 T$$

$$\text{PDMS: } \delta_2 = 15.92 - 0.0256 T$$

However, closer inspection of Figure 4 shows that there is a break in the lines at the mesophase transition temperatures. This parallels the behaviour of other thermodynamic properties although the relative differences between the different mesophases is smaller. The behaviour of the three LC's is similar and distinct from that of PDMS suggesting that the major interactions are with the mesogen and the polymer backbone is relatively unimportant. The solubility parameter model is a crude description of solution behaviour and the validity of any conclusions drawn from the detail of the results should be viewed with caution. However, these results suggest that the enthalpic interactions in these cyanobiphenyls are very similar for both the low molar mass and polymeric LC materials.

Application of this model allows estimation of the enthalpic and entropic contributions to the interactions through Equation (2). These are listed for two probes in Table 2 which clearly shows that this solubility parameter treatment predicts a significant contribution to the measured interaction parameter from entropic effects. The similarity of behaviour of the low molar mass



and polymeric LC's in contrast to PDMS and relative unimportance of the polymer backbone in determining the interactions is also further highlighted.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

This work has shown that the IGC treatment of Guillet and co-workers can successfully be applied to liquid crystalline stationary phases. The retention differences between the mesophases can be seen. Comparison of a polymeric LC with low molar mass analogues suggests that the retention behaviour is dominated by interaction with the mesogen and that the polymer backbone has only a minor modifying effect.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We are grateful to EPSRC for the award of a Research Studentship (to IMS) and to Merck Ltd. (Poole, UK) for provision of the LC materials.

**REFERENCES**

1. Z.Y. Al-Saigh and J.E. Guillet, in R. Meyers (Editor), *Encyclopedia of Analytical Chemistry: Instrumentation and Applications*, Wiley, Chichester, 2000, p. 7759
2. J.E.G. Lipson and J.E. Guillet, in J.V. Dawkins (Editor), *Developments in polymer characterisation 3*, Applied Science Publishers, Barking, 1982, p. 2.
3. D.R. Lloyd, T.C. Ward and H.P. Schreiber (Eds.) *Inverse Gas Chromatography: Characterisation of Polymers and Other Materials*, Amer. Chem. Soc., Washington DC, 1989.
4. J.H. Hildebrand, R.W. Scott and J.M. Prausnitz, *Regular and Related Solutions*, Van Nostrand, New York, 1972.
5. G.M. Bristow and W.F. Watson, *Trans. Farad. Soc.* **54** (1958) 1731.
6. G. DiPaola-Baranyi and J.E. Guillet, *Macromolecules* **11** (1978) 228.
7. J.E.G. Lipson and J.E. Guillet, in R.B. Seymour and G.A. Stahl (Ed), *Macromolecular solutions: solvent-property relationships in polymers*, Pergamon Press, New York, 1982.
8. G.J. Price, in D.R. Lloyd, T.C. Ward and H.P. Schreiber (Editors), *Inverse gas chromatography - Characterisation of polymers and other materials: A.C.S Symposium Series 391*, Amer. Chem. Soc., Washington DC, 1989, p. 48.
9. M. Hamed and R.P. Danner, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.* **80** (2001) 197.
10. B.C. Hancock, P. York and R.C. Rowe, *Int. J. Pharmaceutics* **148** (1997) 1.
11. S.M. Pestov, V.A. Molotchko and R.A. Lidine, *Thermochimica Acta* **236** (1994) 131.
12. A. Voelkel and T. Kopczynski, *J. Chromatogr. A* **795** (1998) 349.
13. M.A. Pena, Y. Daali, J. Barra and P. Bustamante, *Chem. & Pharm. Bull.* **48** (2000) 179.
14. Z.D. Hu and H.W. Zhang, *J. Chromatogr. A* **653** (1993) 275.
15. G. Liu and Z. Xin, *Chromatographia* **42** (1996) 290.
16. R.P.J. Ranatunga and P.W. Carr, *Anal. Chem.* **72** (2000) 5679.
17. C.M. Wai, S.F. Wang and J.J. Yu, *Anal. Chem.* **68** (1996) 3516.
18. Z. Liu, H.F. Zou, M.L. Ye, J.Y. Ni and Y.K. Zhang, *J. Chromatogr. A* **863** (1999) 69.
19. C.B. McArdle, *Side chain liquid crystal polymers*, Blackie, London, 1989.

20. I.C. Khoo, *Liquid crystals: physical properties and nonlinear optical phenomena*, Wiley Interscience, New York, 1995.
21. P.J. Collings, *Liquid crystals: Nature's delicate phase of matter*, Hilger, Bristol, 1990.
22. G.J. Price and I.M. Shillcock, *Canad. J. Chem.* **73** (1995) 1883.
23. G.J. Price, S.J. Hickling and I.M. Shillcock, *Submitted for publication*.
24. J.R. Conder and C.L. Young, *Physicochemical measurement by gas chromatography*, Wiley, New York, 1978.
25. *Selected values of the properties of hydrocarbons and related compounds: Thermodynamics Research Centre Data Project*, College Station, Texas, 1965 and later revisions.
26. G.J. Price and J.E. Guillet, *J. Solution Chem* **16** (1987) 605.
27. J. Brandrup and E.H. Immergut (J. Brandrup and E.H. Immergut(J. Brandrup and E.H. Immerguts), *The Polymer Handbook*, Wiley, New York, 1975.
28. C.M. Hansen, *J. Paint Technol.* **39** (1967) 104.
29. A. Voelkel and J. Janas, *J. Chromatogr.* **669** (1994) 89.

**Table 1:** Solubility parameters,  $\delta$ , and the dispersion,  $\delta_d$ , and polar,  $\delta_p$ , contributions at different temperatures, °C. Values in  $(\text{J cm}^{-3})^{1/2}$  with standard deviations in parentheses.

| Phase         | °C   | $\delta$   | $\delta_d$ | $\delta_p$ | Phase         | °C    | $\delta$   | $\delta_d$ | $\delta_p$ |
|---------------|------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>HCB N</b>  | 60.4 | 17.7 (0.3) | 15.5       | 8.5        | <b>HCB I</b>  | 81.1  | 17.0 (0.3) | 14.8       | 8.4        |
|               | 64.5 | 17.7 (0.3) | 15.9       | 7.8        |               | 91.3  | 17.0 (0.3) | 14.7       | 8.5        |
|               | 68.7 | 17.5 (0.3) | 15.4       | 8.3        |               | 101.5 | 16.7 (0.3) | 14.2       | 8.8        |
|               | 72.7 | 17.4 (0.3) | 15.1       | 8.6        |               | 111.5 | 16.6 (0.3) | 13.6       | 9.5        |
| <b>OCB S</b>  | 58.0 | 17.6 (0.4) | 14.9       | 9.4-       | <b>OCB N</b>  | 68.1  | 17.3 (0.4) | 14.8       | 9.0        |
|               | 61.1 | 17.5 (0.4) | 15.0       | 9.0        |               | 70.4  | 17.1 (0.4) | 14.6       | 8.9        |
|               | 64.1 | 17.4 (0.4) | 14.7       | 9.3        |               | 72.9  | 17.1 (0.4) | 14.7       | 8.7        |
|               | 65.6 | 17.3 (0.4) | 14.9       | 8.7        |               | 74.8  | 17.2 (0.4) | 14.6       | 9.0        |
| <b>OCB I</b>  | 82.0 | 17.3 (0.3) | 14.4       | 9.5        |               |       |            |            |            |
|               | 85.1 | 17.1 (0.5) | 14.3       | 9.4        |               |       |            |            |            |
|               | 90.3 | 16.9 (0.5) | 14.1       | 9.3        |               |       |            |            |            |
|               | 95.4 | 16.6 (0.3) | 14.1       | 8.7        |               |       |            |            |            |
| <b>PMCB S</b> | 50.0 | 17.1 (0.3) | 15.5       | 7.2        | <b>PMCB I</b> | 79.4  | 16.7 (0.3) | 14.7       | 7.9        |
|               | 54.6 | 17.2 (0.4) | 15.4       | 7.7        |               | 85.0  | 16.4 (0.3) | 14.6       | 7.5        |
|               | 59.7 | 16.7 (0.3) | 15.2       | 6.9        |               | 90.0  | 16.2 (0.3) | 14.3       | 7.6        |
|               | 64.3 | 16.8 (0.3) | 15.6       | 6.3        |               | 94.9  | 16.0 (0.3) | 14.2       | 7.4        |
| <b>PDMS</b>   | 60.3 | 14.4 (0.1) | 13.6       | 4.7        |               |       |            |            |            |
|               | 69.5 | 14.1 (0.1) | 13.4       | 4.4        |               |       |            |            |            |
|               | 80.1 | 13.9 (0.1) | 13.1       | 4.6        |               |       |            |            |            |
|               | 90.5 | 13.6 (0.1) | 13.5       | 1.6        |               |       |            |            |            |


**Table 2:** Enthalpic  $\chi^H$  and entropic  $\chi^S$  contributions to the interaction parameter for hexane and benzene at different temperatures.

| Phase         | °C   | Hexane   |          | Benzene  |          |
|---------------|------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|               |      | $\chi^H$ | $\chi^S$ | $\chi^H$ | $\chi^S$ |
| <b>PDMS</b>   | 80.0 | 0.02     | 0.36     | 0.26     | 0.19     |
| <b>PMCB S</b> | 60.0 | 0.45     | 0.88     | 0.02     | 0.60     |
| <b>PMCB I</b> | 85.0 | 0.51     | 0.45     | 0.00     | 0.27     |
| <b>HCB N</b>  | 66.0 | 0.74     | 0.91     | 0.00     | 0.65     |
| <b>HCB I</b>  | 86.0 | 0.72     | 0.63     | 0.01     | 0.36     |
| <b>OCB S</b>  | 58.0 | 0.68     | 1.02     | 0.00     | 0.67     |
| <b>OCB N</b>  | 70.0 | 0.66     | 0.94     | 0.00     | 0.59     |
| <b>OCB I</b>  | 85.0 | 0.78     | 0.61     | 0.02     | 0.29     |


**CAPTIONS FOR FIGURES**

- Figure 1:** Estimation of PDMS solubility parameter at 60 °C (●) and 90 °C (■).  $F_n(\chi)$  is the function represented by the left-hand side of Equation (3)
- Figure 2:** Estimation of HCB solubility parameters at 60 and 73 °C in the nematic mesophase and 81 and 102 °C in the isotropic phase.
- Figure 3:** Estimation of the contributions to HCB solubility parameter at 73 °C in the nematic mesophase. The lines indicate fits to the aliphatic probes ( $\delta_1 < 16 \text{ (J cm}^{-3})^{1/2}$ ) and aromatic probes ( $\delta_1 > 16 \text{ (J cm}^{-3})^{1/2}$ )
- Figure 4:** Solubility parameters  $(\text{J cm}^{-3})^{1/2}$  as a function of temperature for PDMS, HCB, OCB and PMCB.

**Figure 1:** Estimation of PDMS solubility parameter at 60 °C (●) and 90 °C (■).  $F_n(\chi)$  is the function represented by the left-hand side of Equation (3)




**Figure 2:** Estimation of HCB solubility parameters at 60 and 73 °C in the nematic mesophase and 81 and 102 °C in the isotropic phase.





**Figure 3:** Estimation of the contributions to HCB solubility parameter at 73 °C in the nematic mesophase. The lines indicate fits to the aliphatic probes ( $\delta_1 < 16 \text{ (J cm}^{-3})^{1/2}$ ) and aromatic probes ( $\delta_1 > 16 \text{ (J cm}^{-3})^{1/2}$ )



**Figure 4:** Solubility parameters ( $\text{J cm}^{-3})^{1/2}$  as a function of temperature for PDMS, HCB, OCB and PMCB.

